



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,215	05/22/2001	Russell D. Beste	AERX070DIV	9634

24353 7590 12/19/2003

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
200 MIDDLEFIELD RD
SUITE 200
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,215

Applicant(s)

BESTE, RUSSELL D.

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of claims 5 and 7 as anticipated by Mueller in Paper #14, Pages 2 – 3, Paragraph 3 is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in Paper #18.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 6, 8 and 9 over Mueller in Paper #14, Pages 3 – 4, Paragraph 5 is withdrawn due to Applicant's amendments in Paper #18.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elder et al. (USPN 3,770,560).

Elder et al. discloses a laminated material (Column 11, line 38 and Figures 1 – 2A) comprising first and second layers (Figure 2A, #1 and 4) with a layer of adhesive in between (Figure 2A, #5). The layers of material are made of plastic material (Column 2, lines 54 – 58), where the layers of material have different coefficients of thermal expansion since many

Art Unit: 1772

different types of plastic material are used (Column 3, line 66 to Column 4, line 25). The second layer has a thickness with a hole extending through it (Figure 2A, #7). The area of the first layer aligned with the hole of the second layer is not laminated to the second layer and is free of adhesive material (Column 4, line 64 to Column 5, line 8). The laminated material of Elder et al. has many uses including insulation material (Column 1, lines 54 – 64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elder et al. in view of Sumiya et al. (USPN 4,786,558).

Elder et al. discloses a laminated material (Column 11, line 38 and Figures 1 – 2A) comprising first and second layers (Figure 2A, #1 and 4) with a layer of adhesive in between (Figure 2A, #5). The layers of material are made of plastic material (Column 2, lines 54 – 58), where the layers of material have different coefficients of thermal expansion since many different types of plastic material are used (Column 3, line 66 to Column 4, line 25). The second layer has a thickness with a hole extending through it (Figure 2A, #7). The area of the first layer aligned with the hole of the second layer is not laminated to the second layer and is free of adhesive material (Column 4, line 64 to Column 5, line 8). The laminated material of Elder et al.

Art Unit: 1772

has many uses including insulation material (Column 1, lines 54 – 64). However, Elder et al. fails to disclose the first layer comprising polyimide, the second layer comprising polyethylene and the first layer having a peak-to-peak roughness of less than about 20 microns.

Sumiya et al. teach a laminated material, composite film, (Column 23, lines 56) made with a plastic film chosen from polyimide (Column 2, lines 18 – 21) coated with a water soluble compound of polyethylene (Column 26, lines 46 – 53), where the film has a surface roughness of between 0.5 and 20 μ (Column 13, lines 65) for the purpose of forming a protective layered structure (Column 1, lines 38 – 42) that includes insulation.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the polyimide and polyethylene with the desired roughness in Elder et al. in order to form a protective layered structure that includes insulation as taught by Sumiya et al.

Regarding the limitation of the of the laminated material being configured for use in laser ablation, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7 and 9 – 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (703) 306-5480. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (703) 308-4251. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln
pln

[Signature]
HAROLD PYON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
1772

12/16/03